SINGLE BENCH

(2)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 5831 /2006

PETITIONER : **Virendra Kumar Dubey**
S/o Shri K. N. Dubey,
Age about 41 years, Lecturer,
Govt. B.T.I., Dongargarh, R/o - Lal Bag,
Distt. - Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

P.R. No. 5861/06
Presented by Shri A.P. Shrivastava
dated 26-10-06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1. **State Govt. of Chhattisgarh**
Through : Secretary,
School Education Department Ministry,
D.K.S. Bhavan, Raipur (C.G.)

2. **District Education Officer**
Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

RECEIVED-COPY
26/10/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

Petitioner most humbly submit as under :-

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (s) No. 5831 of 2006

Petitioner : Virendra Kumar Dubey

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & another

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri**.

Shri Ajay Shrivastava, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri Utkarsh Verma, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents.

ORDER

(30th October, 2006)

1. The petitioner is working as Assistant Teacher in the government school. In the course of his service as Assistant Teacher, the petitioner has obtained B.Ed./B.T.I. examination certificate on his own expenses before 1.3.1999.

2. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is entitled to two advance increments in view of the decision of this Court in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another {2006 (II) MPJR-CG 96}. This Court in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another (Supra), came to the conclusion that the teachers, who had obtained B. Ed. /B.T.I. Examination Certificate on their own expenses, are covered by the circular dated 24.12.98 (Annexure P/7) issued by the State Government of Madhya Pradesh.

3. Further in the matter of Smt. Manorama Shrivastava Vs. State of M.P. and others { 2000 (1) M.P.L.S.R. 136 } the Madhya Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal, Gwalior Bench, while considering the circular dated 1.3.1999 wherein, it is provided that the Assistant Teachers, who have acquired B.Ed. degree at their own cost between 23.10.1964 and 7.5.1973 shall be entitled to two advance increments, relied on decision in the case of Rakesh Kumar Shrivastava Vs. State of M.P. & others passed in O.A.No. 1632/99, decided on 12.10.1999 wherein it is observed that the

17

circular dated 1.3.1999 cannot be made applicable retrospectively. Thus, a teacher, may be Assistant Teacher, who has obtained B.Ed. degree before 1.3.1999 is entitled to two advance increments.

4. It is pointed out by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that the then State of Madhya Pradesh had filed a Special Leave Petition against the orders passed by the Tribunal and the Hon'ble Supreme Court dismissed Special Leave Petition No. 1999/2000 filed against the order of the Tribunal. Therefore, the direction to the effect that the circular dated 1.3.1999 cannot be made applicable retrospectively, passed by the Tribunal, becomes final and the same shall be applicable to all the Assistant Teachers who have obtained B.Ed./B.T.I. examination certificate before 1.3.1999. It is further substantiated by a circular dated 17.10.2003 issued by the present State of Madhya Pradesh wherein the circular clearly states about the decision of the Supreme Court.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the facts and question of law involved in the present case are squarely covered by decision of this Court in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another (Supra), to which learned counsel appearing for the respondents fairly concedes and agrees with the averment made by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed in terms of the order passed in the case of Yashwant Kumar Bharadwaj Vs. Municipal Corporation, Durg and another (Supra), subject to verification of the fact as to whether the petitioner has acquired B. Ed./B.T.I. Examination Certificate on his own expenses as per the circulars dated 24.12.1998 1.3.1999 and further whether he has been paid two advance increments or not. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

akur